

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
FORT WORTH DIVISION

ODULAJA SAMSON ODUWOLE, §  
§  
*Plaintiff,* §  
§  
v. § Civil Action No. 4:23-cv-01127-O-BP  
§  
LYFT INC., §  
§  
*Defendant.* §

**ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATION  
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

On February 12, 2024, the United States Magistrate Judge made Findings, Conclusions, and a Recommendation (ECF No. 10) in this case. Plaintiff filed an Objection (ECF No. 12) on March 1, 2024. The District Court reviewed the Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation and Plaintiff's Objection de novo. Finding no error therein, the Court **ACCEPTS** the Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (ECF No. 10).

It is undisputed that Plaintiff is *pro se* and unlicensed to practice law. Well-established law therefore dictates that Plaintiff cannot adequately serve as a class action representative or otherwise represent the legal interests of any other person. *See McGrew v. Texas Bd. of Pardons & Paroles*, 47 F.3d 158, 162 (5th Cir. 1995); *Rodgers v. Lancaster Police & Fire Dep't*, 819 F.3d 205, 210 (5th Cir. 2016); *see also, e.g., Williams v. Solar Alternatives, Inc.*, No. CV 23-2533, 2023 WL 4931853, at \*2 (E.D. La. Aug. 2, 2023) (collecting cases). Moreover, even by the most generous construction of Plaintiff's pleadings, he alleges individual damages totaling an amount less than the amount in controversy requirement of federal diversity jurisdiction. Plaintiff's cause of action against Defendant is therefore wanting of federal subject-matter jurisdiction and should be

dismissed on the basis. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1332. Throughout his 36-page Objection, Plaintiff proffers nothing to rebut these well-supported findings and conclusions. *See* Objection, ECF No. 12.

Based on the foregoing, the Court determines de novo that Plaintiff's cause of action against Defendant should be dismissed without prejudice. Plaintiff is not barred from otherwise pursuing this cause of action in a state court of competent jurisdiction.

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that Plaintiff's cause of action against Defendant should be and is hereby **DISMISSED without prejudice**. Separate final judgment shall issue.

**SO ORDERED** on this **7th day of March, 2024**.



---

Reed O'Connor  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE